DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 193 794 EA 013 062

AUTHOR Weber, Margaret E.; And Others
TITLE A Study of Factors Affecting Career Aspirations of Women Teachers and Educational Administrators.
PUB DATE Apr 80
NOTE 94p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 7-11, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Administrators; Family Influence; *Females; *Occupational Aspiration; Private Schools; Public Schools; Questionnaires; School Surveys; *Sex Discrimination; *Sex Role; Teacher Attitudes; Teachers

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine characteristics and perceptions of women who hold administrative positions and of women teachers who may aspire to administrative positions in public or private elementary and secondary education. Specifically, the study focused on the following questions: What traditional personal and social definitions of roles for women affect their choice of whether to continue in or pursue a career in educational administration? What are the individual beliefs and attitudes that affect a woman's choice to pursue an administrative position? What are the personal and family constraints that deter women from seeking administrative positions in education? Are the aspiration levels of women different in teachers and administrators? What kinds of discriminatory employment practices do women who seek educational administrative positions perceive? In summarizing the data collected from teachers and administrators in an urban public school system and a large metropolitan association of private schools, the authors note that psychological and sociological factors compounded with institutionalized barriers to women in education and employment appear to have created an atmosphere in which few women seem to aspire to and to succeed in obtaining administrative positions. Extensive tables and three questionnaires used in the study are appended. (Author/IRT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED193794

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A Study of Factors Affecting Career Aspirations of Women Teachers and Educational Administrators

Margaret B. Weber
Educational Testing Service

Jean R. Feldman
DeKalb Community College

Eve C. Poling
The Children's School

DRAFT

Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association (AERA) Annual Meeting, Boston, April 7 - 11, 1980

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M. B. Weber

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 013 062

Although women constitute a majority in the teaching profession, they are not proportionately represented in administrative positions in education. The most recent NEA survey available (1976) reports that 87.2% of elementary teachers and 47.8% of secondary teachers are female. However, only 16.6% of elementary teachers report having a female principal and only 2.3% of secondary teachers report working for a female principal. Women are equally underrepresented in district administrative positions where males hold 97% of all assistant superintendencies and 99% of all superintendencies (NCES, 1977).

These figures reflect a sexual imbalance within the professional between teachers and administrators.[1] To understand this imbalance, researchers have looked at status of the profession (e.g. Heyns, 19), societal pressures (e.g. Coursen, 1975), discrimination patterns in training, hiring and promotion (e.g. Blanchard, 1976), as well as personal and social roles (e.g. Helson, 1972; Niedermayer and Kramer, 1974). For whatever reason or combination of

---

[1] Administrators: Administrators are defined as superintendents, assistant superintendents, principals, assistant principals, and supervisors.

Teachers: Classroom teachers include elementary classroom teachers, middle and high school teachers, special education, and other special subject teachers.

reasons, since World War II, women's role in educational administration has declined. The percentage of elementary and secondary principals who were women has dropped sharply since 1948 (NEA, 1973; Tennessee Teacher, 1978).

The reasons for the decreasing number of women in educational leadership positions are complex:

- Women have few role models in educational administration as most administrators are male.
- Women are excluded from the male "buddy system" which passes jobs from man to man.

In addition, traditional role definitions affecting both male and female attitudes towards women as administrators may act as deterrents to women pursuing a career in educational administration. Traditional attitudes about appropriate female behavior create a stressful situation for women. If they "push" their potential in other than traditionally defined female ways, they may be thought to have behaved inappropriately to their sex. And, since women have been more negatively valued than men, they tend to have poorer self concepts than men (Broverman, et al, 1972). Further, women

tend not to have been given the same opportunities as men to develop their potential (Cavender, 1974). In summary, traditional patterns in society, compounded with existing myths and attitudes, appear to have created an atmosphere in which few women seem to aspire to and/or to succeed in obtaining administrative positions.

This disproportionate representation of women in administrative positions reported nationally also holds in Georgia, where men hold the majority of administrative positions (see Tables 1 and 2). Here, as elsewhere, women represent a majority in the teaching profession, but a minority in administrative decision-making positions.

The literature speaks of the vanishing woman administrator. Much has been theorized and commented on why she is vanishing but little large scale empirical work has been done in this area. Therefore, it is appropriate to go directly to women teachers and try to determine if they do aspire to become administrators but are just not successful. Women who do hold administrative positions can also provide insight into the problem.

The purpose of this study was to examine characteristics and perceptions of women who now hold administrative positions, and women teachers who may

aspire to administrative positions in public or private elementary and secondary education. Specifically, the study focused on the following questions:

Traditional Personal and Social Definitions of Roles.[2]

- What traditional personal and social definitions of roles for women affect their choice to continue in, to pursue, or not to pursue a career in educational administration?
- What are the individual beliefs[3] and attitudes that affect a woman's choice to pursue an administrative position?
- Personal and Family Constraints.[4] What are the personal and family constraints that deter women from seeking administrative positions in education?

---

[2]Roles: Roles are sets of normatively determined behaviors and characteristics attendant to categories.

Personal roles: Personal roles refers to how a person views himself/herself as they really are.

Social roles: Social roles refers to the "status quo," and reflects normative attitudes toward modes of conduct for a particular role.

[3]Individual beliefs and attitudes: Individual beliefs and attitudes refers to women's perceptions of the role of administrator.

[4]Personal and family constraints: Personal and family constraints refers to the difficulties and conflicts a woman has to deal with in order to become an administrator.

- Aspiration Level.[5] Are the aspiration levels of women different in teachers and administrators?

- Discriminatory Employment Practices.[6] What kinds of discriminatory employment practices do women who seek educational administrative positions perceive?

---

[5]Aspiration level: Aspiration level refers to the employment goals set by a woman for herself.

[6]Discriminatory employment practices: Discriminatory employment practices refers to the preferential treatment often given men in administration.

Review of Research

Traditional Personal and Social Definition of Roles

To understand why women have occupied primarily low-ranking positions in the field of education, one can look at the traditional female role. Society has conditioned both men and women to believe that women are not as capable as men of holding positions of leadership (Coursen, 1975). This conditioning, which has inhibited or made difficult women's aspirations to positions of leadership in education, begins in early childhood when girls are urged to be passive, dependent, and to conform whereas boys are encouraged to be aggressive physically and verbally (Osofsky, 1971). The adult male role is defined by such traits as dominance, achievement, autonomy, and aggression. Such traits are also commonly accepted although not necessarily characteristic of leadership (Maccoby and Jacklin, 1974). Traits which define the adult female role are the opposite--emotionalism, passivity, timidity, deference, and self-abasement (Bach, 1976). Thus, women are expected to assume a role embodying characteristics and attributes exactly opposite of those most often associated with leadership qualities.

Some of the traditional personal and social definitions of roles, which lead to discriminatory practices, originate with and are perpetuated by women against themselves. For example, women tend to perceive themselves as less competent than

men (e.g. Schmuck, 1975; Taylor, 1973). Further, those traits associated with the male role are considered more desirable by both men and women (Broverman, et al., 1972). Thus, females are acculturated to incorporate traints which are considered antithetical to leadership roles and to accept the superiority and desirability of traits they are socially sanctioned to avoid. A more subtle manipulation of the sanction of social criticism is evident, which reinforces a low evaluation of women in education and negative self images.

The reoccurring criticism of our nation's educational system over the past two decades has played upon the conflict between role perception and perceived attributes of leadership found in women. Charges of over-feminized schools (Coursen, 1975), of classrooms as mindless prisons of the young (Silberman, 1970), and of schools as sanctuaries for the incompetent (Pipho, 1978) have all, directly or indirectly, placed the women educator at the root cause of the problems in public education. The focus of these attacks has been at levels most heavily occupied by women--the classroom where two thirds of the work force is female (NEA, 1976). The message from the male critics is clear: women educators are incompetent and undeserving of leadership positions.

Personal and Family Constraints

Facing social and personal image obstacles to advancement in educational leadership, women are also forced to resolve conflicts between family responsibilities, career aspirations and the perceived characteristics of leadership. For example, although it is now acceptable for a married woman to work (Helson, 1972), some jobs are perceived by society as socially acceptable for women and compatible with traditional family goals while others are not. Teaching is an example of a socially acceptable job whereas leadership positions are perceived as being incompatible with the female role within the traditional family (Niedermayer and Kramer, 1974).

But even if teaching is socially acceptable, it is traditionally a supplementary occupation. The woman is expected to sustain both her occupation and the prime responsibility of home and family. Many women who hold full time jobs are also the primary maintainers of their home and children. Even if husbands share in these activities, there may be more psychological stress affecting women. Competing demands between the professional role and mothering role cannot be conveniently manipulated where the woman's career status is traditionally secondary to the male's. In this case the woman is twice victim to conflict, within her roles as professional and mother and between herself and mate in their respective parental and career roles. 10

Psychological stress from such conflict may account for the results of studies reported by Krchniak (1978) and Gross and Trask (1976). In his study of women who held administrative and supervisory certificates, Krchniak (1978) found very few women with preschool and elementary children (8%). Krchniak further found a large majority (84%) of the women travel less than 20 miles between their homes and place of employment. "Obviously, their mobility is severely limited by circumstances of family obligations, husband's jobs, and, for much of the sample, high placement on the salary schedule." He concluded that this lack of mobility is a factor which can have a negative effect on obtaining a job in administration.

Presently, women who have leadership positions appear to have resolved "within" role conflict by foregoing motherhood or waiting to assume such positions until after the child bearing and raising years. Given age data the latter appears to be the rule. However, delay as a resolution probably involves broken service which removes the women from the competitive cutting edge with youth. Upon return the woman is seen as less attractive for promotion when compared to her more youthful male competition who, incidently, also needs the additional income of the administrative position to support his young family!

Gross and Trask (1976) reported a striking difference in the marital status of men and women principals. Nine out of ten men in their study were

married, while almost two-thirds of the women were single. The evidence here suggests that the "between" wife and husband conflict has been resolved by the majority of these women by denying themselves the role of wife.

Resolution between family constraints and perceived characteristics associated with career roles is manifested in levels of career aspirations among women. Mason (1961) reports that 51% of male beginning teachers aspire to leave the classroom and become school administrators as compared with 9% of the single women, 8% of the married women, and 19% of the widowed, separated, and divorced women. Males have identified long term career goals at an earlier time than women in education. Apparently women initially entering the field have been conditioned to accept their career as secondary to their potential mates. Only after the loss of that mate is there a shift in attitude and aspiration toward the primacy of their own career.

Even possession of leadership credentials appears to have little impact on the career aspirations of women. For example, Schmuck (1975) concluded that women are less ambitious than men in the field of education. She based this conclusion on the observation that whereas men reapplied for an administrative position three times during a four year period, women reapplied on the average less than one time.

Krchniak's research supports Schmuck's conclusion. He reported that 61%

of the women in his study who were certified for an administrative position were not interested in such employment, 26% indicated moderate interest, and 13% were extremely interested. And only 3% of the respondents claimed to be making an "all out effort" to get a job in administration.

Discriminatory Education and Employment Practices

Men are more likely than women to receive advanced training and to seek certification in administration (Cohen, 1971; Howard, 1975). Reasons for this disparity may be found in the lack of female role models in either training institutions or in the field, negative attitudes of counselors and professors toward women in administration, and a lack of encouragement for women administrators within the profession.

Female role models in training institutions are scarce. Approximately 98% of the faculty in departments of educational administration or its equivalent are males (Cirincione-Coles, 1975). Nor are female students in administration likely to find same sex student colleagues in their classes since approximately 92% of all students in educational administration or similar programs are males (Circincione-Coles, 1975).

Further, women are not encouraged to become educational administrators from within the public education system. Indeed, Bach (1976) suggests that women

who do show interest in pursuing non-teaching careers in education are urged to become counselors, educational specialists, or supervisors and are rarely encouraged to become administrators. This observation was confirmed by Lesser (1978) when he reported that most of the increase in the number of women administrators was in personnel/support positions, rather than in positions of decision-making and control.

Contributing to the dilemma faced by women seeking advanced training in educational administration and trying to balance role and job perception are employment practices which facilitate leadership mobility for men and discourage it for women. For not only do men dominate leadership mobility in education in terms of positions held and dollars earned (NEA, 1973; Taylor, 1973; Lesser, 1978) but they also dominate the decision-making processes which may discourage women from entering the administrative ranks.

The fact that women principals are older and more experienced than men clearly reflects discrimination. The median age for women principals is 56, as compared to 44 for men (Coursen, 1975). Gross and Trask (1976) corroberated that female principals tended to be older but additionally they have had more than three times as much teaching experience as men principals. Women are apparently forced to longer apprenticeships in order to establish their bone fides.

Discrimination against women may not appear to exist at the entry level into the educational profession. However, patterns of discrimination emerge when differential rates of promotion and advancement in the field of education are examined (Muhich, 1974; Blanchard, 1976). For example, Taylor (1973) showed that male superintendents were unlikely to hire women as administrators, although there were no written policies precluding women. Indeed, data revealed that sex was the only factor which had any significant relationship to the hiring process. Other variables such as age, length of experience, size of school district and background, and type of position had no relationship to the hiring process. Krchniak (1978) also found that many women had experienced forms of discrimination first hand, or were victims of community attitudes and school board pressures.

"Cronyism," or the buddy system, where men refer other male associates to jobs, has handicapped many women (Taylor, 1973; Courson, 1975; Howard, 1975), as has the reliance on informal word-of-mouth or local bulletins for job information (Krchniak, 1978). Thus, employment discrimination against women has been found through age data, comparative years of teaching experience, and promotion schedules.

In summary, the reasons for the decreasing number of women in educational leadership positions are complex. Traditional role definitions affecting both male and female attitudes towards women as administrators act as deterrents to women pursuing a career in educational administration. Traditional attitudes about appropriate female behavior create a stressful situation for women. If they "push" their potential in other than traditionally defined ways, they may be thought to have behaved inappropriately. And, since women have been more negatively valued than men, they tend not to have self concepts strong enough to pursue "inappropriate" role behaviors (e.g. Broverman et al., 1972). Further, women tend not to have been allowed the same opportunities to develop their potential as men (Cavender, 1974). In addition, women have few role models in educational administration since most administrators are male and they are generally excluded from the male "buddy system" which passes jobs from man to man.

Psychological and sociological factors, compounded with institutionalized barriers to women in education and employment, appear to have created an atmosphere in which few women seem to aspire to and/or to succeed in obtaining administrative positions. The perpetuation of these barriers should be recognized and eliminated or the phenomenon of the vanishing female administrator will continue.

Methodology

Design and Sample

A survey methodology was selected for this study. The population is women teachers and women administrators employed in a large urban public school system or in a large metropolitan association of private schools.

Based on the sex distribution at teaching and administrative levels in each participating school system in the year preceeding this study, a proportionate stratified random sample of 600 women teachers and administrators were identified (see Tables 3 and 4). Materials found in Appendices A and B, along with a cover letter requesting their cooperation, were distributed to the respondents. Those respondents not returning questionnaires two weeks after distribution received a reminder and were sent a second copy of the materials. One month after initial distribution of the questionnaires, an additional random sample was drawn sufficient to attempt to bring the response rate to 300 from each system.

Instrumentation

The Role Definition scales (see Miller, 1978, Appendix) were modified for use in this study to examine how women view themselves, teachers, and administrators. Although originally developed to identify traditional and nontraditional perceptions of self and others, Miller's semantic differential scales were readily adapted to the purpose of this study by a change of stem on two of the three scales. The items were scored so that a traditional feminine response was high.

A pilot study of these revised scales was conducted. Test-retest estimates of greater than .90 were obtained from the pilot study. Internal consistency estimates based on the study sample of 672 yielded similar results (see Table 5).

Three questionnaires were developed (found in Appendix), based on the literature review. Included were items from the five general questions which focused on women's choices to pursue or not to pursue a career in educational administration: Role definitions, personal and family constraints, aspiration level, perception of discriminatory employment practices, and beliefs and attitudes about educational administration.

Items were designed to deal with traditional definition of roles, representing both a woman's own self-image and those imposed upon her by traditional and cultural expectations. Items dealing with personal and family constraints were developed to sift out the difficulties and conflicts a woman has to deal with in order to become an administrator. Items about aspiration level refer to employment goals set by a woman for herself. Discriminatory employment practices are investigated through items dealing with apparent preferential treatment often given men in educational administration. And, finally, items dealing with individual beliefs and attitudes toward educational administration are included to try to understand women's perception of the role of administrator. Each of these instruments were pilotted during the summer of 1978 among a small group of graduate students in a teacher training program. Appropriate revisions were made.

Hopotheses

In order to determine why more women do not hold or pursue administrative positions, the following hypotheses were tested.

Traditional Personal and Social Definitions of Roles:

H_1: There is no significant difference expressed by women teachers and women administrators in the role perceptions of Self, Teachers, or Administrators.

Aspiration:

H_2: There are no significant differences in role perceptions of self, teachers, or administrators between teachers who aspire to administrative jobs and teachers who do not.

Personal and Family Constraints:

H_3: There are no significaut differences in personal and family constraints for women administrators than for women teachers.

Discriminatory Employment Practices:

H_4: There is no significant difference in perception of discriminatory employment practices between women teachers and administrators.

Results

The differences in demographic characteristics of the respondents by school type are striking. For example, 98% of the private school respondents are white while 75% of the public school respondents are black (see Table 6).

Approximately two-thirds of the respondents are married (see Table 7). Most have two or fewer children (see Tables 8 and 9) and most are between the ages of thirty and fifty (see Table 10).

Approximately two-thirds of the respondents are elementary teachers (see Table 11). This is consistent with the fact that most respondents report having elementary certification (see Table 12).

Of those respondents who teach, the distribution of grade assignments is similar across school types with the exception of the large number of Specialists reported among public school teachers (see Table 13).

In terms of degree qualifications, the majority of respondents from boht school types hold only bachelors or masters. Fewer than 3% of public school respondents reported holding a doctorate, while only half of 1% of private school respondents reported holding that degree (see Table 14).

Public school respondents reported being employed in the profession and in their current job longer than private school respondents (see Tables 15 and 16). They also belong to more professional organizations (see Table 17).

Hypothesis One

In order to determine if role perceptions are less traditional

among women who hold administrative jobs than among women teachers, H_1 was tested. Significant differences in role perception of Self were found between school types and among employment levels (see Table 18). Both teachers and administrators from the private schools perceived themselves in a significantly more traditional feminine manner than did the public school respondents (see Table 19). Further, administrators from both school types were significantly less traditionally feminine in their perception of Self than were elementary or secondary teachers.

Significant differences were also reported between school types for role perception of Teachers (see Table 20). Again, the private school respondents perceived teachers in a more traditionally feminine manner than did the public school respondents (see Table 21).

And, significant differences were reported between school types but not among employment levels for role perception of Administrators (see Table 22). And, again the private school respondents perceived administrators in a more traditionally feminine manner than did the public school respondents (see Table 23). Thus, H_1 was rejected.

Regardless of the scale stem (i.e. Self, Teachers or Administrators), the private school respondents indicated that they perceive women educators as a group to be more traditionally feminine than do the public school respondents. This indicates that, as a group, the private school respondents perceive the profession as more stereotypic feminine than do public school women educators.

The other significant difference reported here supports the literature that women who have achieved the status of administrator perceive themselves as traditionally less feminine than do women who have not achieved that

status regardless of school type. This result becomes increasingly important as the findings on aspiration levels are discussed later in this section. For whatever reason, women who hold less traditional jobs perceive themselves, teachers and holders of their job class as less stereotypic-less traditional, than do women who hold traditionally feminine jobs in education.

Hypothesis Two

If an application for an administrative position is an indication of aspiration, few of the elementary and secondary teachers from either school type aspire to administrative positions (see Table 24). These aspiration data are consistent with the results discussed under the first hypothesis: If women teachers perceive themselves as traditionally more feminine than the characteristics that they attribute to administrators, it is not surprising that they do not aspire to administrative positions. Further, these data are consistent with respondes to the question" How difficult do you think it is to obtain a job in educational administration?" More than two-thirds of teachers rated that task as difficult to impossible (see Table 25).

In both school types, approximately ninety percent of the respondents had never applied for an administrative position. This is particularly interesting in that for 48% of the public school respondents and 27% of the private school respondents their salary is the primary source of income for their families (see Table 26).

Decisions to become a teacher were made fairly early. Among the public school respondents, 26.8% had decided to become a teacher in elementary school (see Table 27). By high school, approximately half had made this decision. Decisions to become a teacher were made a little later among the private school respondents. However, regardless of when that decision was made, the respondents recognized the influence of college professors most frequently (see Table 28)

An examination of the teachers (only) perceptions of Self, Teachers and Administrators compared with their response to the question:

> If you were qualified, would you apply for an administrative position in education?

indicates that those who replied "No" had a consistently more traditionally feminine perception of those categories than those who had replied "Yes" (see Table 29). And, the perceptions of the "Maybe" respondents was more traditionally feminine than those in the "No" group for Teachers and Administrators.

However, in a series of analyses of variance, no significant differences were reported on the semantic differentials by aspiration status (see Tables 30-32). Thus, H_2 was accepted.

When asked about the positive and negative aspects of the job of an educational administrator, more than half of both public and private school respondents selected salary and challenge as positive and pressure as negative. Interestingly enough, requirements for advanced training or certification were not recorded as a negative aspect by many of the respondents (see Tables 33 and 34).

The private school respondents enjoy their jobs more than public school respondents but most of both groups receive some degree of enjoyment from them job (see Table 35). More than 60% of each group plan to remain in their job for more than ten years (see Table 36). And, when asked what factors would encourage them to leave their current job, one-fourth of the public school group replied "A better job" while only eight percent of the private school group responded in that manner (see Table37).

In terms of overall perception of the job of educational administrator, thirty-one percent of the private school respondents and forty-nine percent of the public school respondents rated it desirable or excellent (see Table 38).

Hypothesis Three

For the purpose of this study, personal and family constraints were defined in terms of numbers of children requiring care, schedules, flexible schedules, flexible superiors and hours spent in job-related activities both at work and at home.

As reported in Tables 39 and 40, no significant differences in the number of children requiring care were reported between teachers and administrators for either school type.

As time constraints are frequently cited as incentive not to leave teaching to become an administrator, the respondents were asked how many hours were spent both on the job and off the job but on job-related activities. As indicated in Tables 41 and 42, over three-fourths of the respondents from both the public and private school types spend between thirty-one and fifty hours per week at their office or classroom with administrators spending significantly more time there than teachers.

Approximately ninety percent of both public and private school respondents reported working as many as twenty hours per week away from their office or classroom but on job-related activities (see Table 43 or 44. However, private school secondary teachers reported spending more time away from their classroom or office working than do administrators.

An examiniation of the responses to questions about the availability of flexible scheduling, fewer high school teachers reported having a flexible schedule than did either elementary teachers or administrators (see Tables 45 and 46). But, in both school types, the majority of respondents reported having either a flexible or sometimes flexible schedule. And, both groups report having sympathetic superiors(see Tables 47 and 48). Thus, scheduling does not appear to be a constraint for women in education.

When asked whether relocation to assume an administrative job was possible, there were no significant differences among public school teachers and administrators (see Table 49). And, approximately half of each level indicated that they would not be willing to relocate. However, among private school respondents, significantly more administrators were definitely

willing to relocate (see Table 50). And approximately three-fourths of private school teachers were not willing to relocate. Thus, for teachers in either school type, a relocation requirement appears to be a constraint and H_3 is rejected.

Hypothesis Four

One of the possible factors inhibiting women from aspiring to administrative positions is their perception of how difficult it is to get such a job. And, as reported in Tables 51 and 52, both teachers and administrators perceive that it is difficult to obtain an administrative job. There are no significant differences between the perceptions of teachers and administrators on thie question. Thus, H_4 is accepted.

And, when asked why more women are not found in administrative positions, the most frequently listed reason was that there are sexist attitudes in personnel departments (see Table 53). Other frequently cited reasons why women are not found in administrative positions include traditional role perceptions and pressures of such jobs. Further, when asked why women do not aspire to administrative position, the most frequently listed response was that there is a lack of available positions (see Table 54). At the same time the respondents recognized that often women simply don't have the contacts to find out about available positions.

References

Abramson, J. The invisible woman. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Bach, L. Of women, school administration, and discipline. Phi Delta Kappan, 1976, 57 (7), 463-366.

Blanchard, P.D. The impact of sex discrimination in the recruitment of educational policy-makers. Paper, Southeastern Conference of the American Society for Public Administrators, Miami Beach, 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 128 946).

Bottomley, M. The case of the female principal: Sex role attitudes and perceptions of sex differences and ability. Australian and New Zealand Jounral of Sociology, 1977, 13 (2).

Carlson, R.O. School superintendents: Careers and performance. Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, Columbus, Ohio, 1972.

Clement, J.P. Sex bias in school leadership. Evanston, Ill.: Integrated Education Associates, 1975.

Cirincione-Coles, K. The administrator: Male or female? Journal of Teacher Education, 1975, 26 (4), 326-9.

Cohen, A.C. Women and higher edcuation: recommendations for change. Phi Delta Kappan, 1971, 53, 164-167.

Cohen, E., Fennell, M.L., Barchas, P.R., McMahan, M., and Hildebrand,P. An alternative perspective on sex differences in organizational settings: The process of legitimation. Sex Roles, 1978, 4, (4).

Cohen, E. Open space schools: The opportunity to become ambitious. Sociology of Education, 1973, 46, 134-161.

Coursen, D. Women and minorities in administration. NAESP School Leadership Digest Series, (no. 11), 1975. (Prepared by ERIC Clearinghouse of Educational Management).

Dale, C.T. Women are still missing persons in administrative and supervisory jobs. Educational Leadership, 1973, 31 (2), 123-127.

Fishel, A., and Pottker, J. Women lose out. The Clearing House, 1973, 47 (7), 387-391.

Frazer, N., and Saker, M. Sexism in school and society. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.

Gordon, S.R., and Ball, P. Survival dynamics for women in educational administration. Journal of NAWDAC, Winter, 1977, 46-48.

Grambs, J.D. Sex role and educational leadership. In Donald LaDue and Stiles N. Sea (eds.), Sexism in education. Pennsylvania Council for the Social Studies, 1973.

Grobman, H. and Hines, V. What makes a good principal? NASSP Bulletin, 1956, 40, 5-16.

Gross, N. and Trask, A.E. The sex factor and the management of schools. New York: Wiley, 1976.

Hare, N.Q. The vanishing woman principal. National Elementary Principal, 1966, 45, 12-12.

Helson, R. The changing image of the career woman. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28 (2).

Hemphill, J.K., Griffiths, D.E., and Frederiksen, N. Administrative performance and personality. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1962.

Higley, J. Training and certification of school principals. NAESP School Leadership Digest, (No. 12), 1975.

Horner, M.S. Towards an understanding of achievement-related conflicts in women. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28 (2), 157-175.

Howard, S. Why aren't women administering our schools? Arlington, Va.: National Council of Administrative Women in Education, 1975.

Hoyle, J. Who shall be principal---a man or a woman? National Elementary Principal, 1969, 48, 24-33.

Kanter, R.R. Men and women of the corporation. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1977.

Krchniak, S.P. Variables associated with low incidence of women in school administration: Towards empirical understanding. Paper presented for the annual meeting of AERA, Toronto, Canada, Marchm 1978.

Krohn, B. The puzzling case of the missing MS. Nation's Schools and Colleges, November, 1974, 32-38.

Lesser, P. The participation of women in public school administration. Paper presented at the 1978 annual meeting the AERA, Toronto, Canada, March, 1978.

Lyon, C.D., and Sarrio, T.N. Women in public education: Sexual discrimination in promotions. Phi Delta Kappan, 1973, 55 (2) 120-123.

Maccoby, E.E., and Jacklin, C.N. The psychology of sex differences. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1974.

Mayhew, L.B. Educational leadership and declining enrollments. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1974.

McMillin, R. Leadership aspirations of prospective teachers--a comparison of men and women. Journal of Teacher Education, 1975, 26, 323-325.

Morsink, H.M. Leader behavior of men and women principals. NASSP Bulletin, 1970, 54 (347), 80-88.

Muhich, D. Discrimination against women in educational administration. Paper, National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, Chicago, 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 114 937).

National Education Association. Status of public school teachers, 1965. NEA Research Bulletin, 1965, 43, 67-71.

National Education Association. Facts on American education. NEA Research Bulletin, 1971, 49 (2), 47-55.

National Education Association. 26th biennial salary and staff survey of public-school professional personnel, 1972-1973. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Niedermayer, G., and Kramer, V.W. Women in administrative positions in public education. Philadelphia: Recruitment Leadership and Training Institute, 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 096 742).

Osofsky, J.D. The socialization and education of American females. In Anne F. Scott (ed.), What is happening to American women? Atlanta: SNPA Foundation Seminar Books, 1971.

Richardson, B. Sexism in higher education. New York: Seabury Press, 1974.

Schmuck, P.A. Sex differentiation in public school administration. Arlington, VA: National Council of Administrative Women in Education, 1975. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 128 966).

Taylor, S.S. Educational leadership: A male domain? Phi Delta Kappan, 1973, 55 (2), 124-128.

Tennessee Teacher, 45 (8), p. 3, April, 1978.

Timpano, D.M. Are you discriminating against women administrators? American School Board Journal, 1976, 163 (6), 19-23.

Tresemer, D. Fear of success, but unproven. Psychology Today. March, 1974, 82-84.

U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau. Women workers today. Washington, D.C.: Author, 1974.

U.S. Department of Labor. Handbook on women workers. Employment Standards Administration. Women's Bureau 1975 Bulletin, 297, p.3.

Van Meir, E.J. Sexual discrimination in school administration opportunity. Journal of NAWDAC, Summer, 1975, 163-167.

Wiles, K. and Grobman, H.G. Principals as leaders. Nation's Schools, 1955, 56, 75-77.

Young, C.K. Women in school administration and supervision: A new leadership dimension. NASSP Bulletin, 1976, 60 (400), 83-87.

Table 1

Leadership Staffing in the

Georgia Department of Education*

Unit	Total Leadership Positions	Occupied by Women	Percent
Executive Committee	7	0	0
State Superintendent	14	0	0
Administrative Services	112	15	13
Instructional Services	127	34	27
Adult and Vocational Education	59	16	27
TOTALS	319	65	20

*Source: Georgia Public Education 1977: State and Local Schools. Compiled and published by Publications and Information Services. General Support Division, Office of Administrative Services, Georgia Department of Education, November, 1976.

Table 2

Leadership Staffing in the

Public Schools of Georgia*

Unit	Total Leadership Positions	Occupied by Women	Percent
Superintendents	188	6	3
School Principals	1785	242	14
(High)	(340)	(13)	(4)
(Middle)	(286)	(19)	(7)
(Elementary)	(1159)	(210)	(18)
Voc-Tech Directors	30	0	0
CESA Directors	16	0	0
TOTALS	2019	248	12

*Source: Georgia Public Education 1977: State and Local Schools. Compiled and published by Publications and Information Services. General Support Division, Office of Administrative Services, Georgia Department of Education, November, 1976.

Table 3

Proportion of Women in the 1978 Population

	Elementary	Secondary	Administrators
Public			
Private			

Table 4

Sample and Response Frequencies

	Sampled			Responded		
	El	Sec.	Admin.	El.	Sec.	Admin.
Public				183	69	35
Private				289	74	22

Table 5

Internal Consistency
Estimates

Semantic Differential Stem	N		# of Items
Myself	672	.9878	32
Teachers	672	.9903	32
Administrators	672	.9899	32

Table 6

Racial Characteristics
of the Respondents

	System			
	Private		Public	
	%	N	%	N
Black	.80	3	74.60	214
Caucasian	98.40	379	23.70	68
Indian	.60	2	.00	0
Oriental	.30	1	.30	1
Other	.00	0	1.40	4
		385		287

Table 7

Marital Status
of the Respondents

	System			
	Private		Public	
	%	N	%	N
Single	27.80	107	31,70	91
Married	70.40	271	61.70	177
Divorced	1.30	5	2.40	7
Widowed	.00	0	2.80	8
Other	.50	2	1.40	4
		385		385

Table 8

Public School Respondents

Number of Children

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Elementary	56 (30.6)	44 (24.0)	51 (27.9)	23 (12.6)	4 (2.2)	4 (2.2)	1 (.5)
High School	25 (36.8)	14 (20.6)	21 (30.9)	6 (8.8)	2 (2.9)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Administrators	8 (22.9)	9 (25.7)	11 (31.4)	2 (5.7)	4 (11.4)	1 (2.9)	0 (0)

Table 9

Private School Respondents

Number of Children

	0	1	2	3	4	5
Elementary	117 (40.6)	34 (11.8)	76 (26.4)	37 (12.8)	15 (5.2)	9 (3.1)
High School	31 (42.5)	8 (11.0)	21 (28.8)	7 (9.6)	4 (5.5)	2 (2.7)
Administrators	12 (54.5)	2 (9.1)	2 (9.1)	5 (22.7)	1 (4.5)	0 (0.0)

Table 10

Respondent's Age

	System			
Years	Private		Public	
	%	N	%	N
20-24	6.20	24	.30	1
25-29	18.20	70	6.30	18
30-39	39.20	151	38.00	109
40-49	26.00	100	28.90	83
50 and over	10.40	40	32.40	76
Total		385		287

Table 11

Job Assignment

	System 6		System 7	
	Private		Public	
	%	N	%	N
Elementary	75.10	289	63.80	183
Secondary	19.20	74	24.00	69
Administrative	5.70	22	12.20	35
	100.00	385	100.00	287

Table 12

Certification

	System			
	Private		Public	
	%	N	%	N
Early Childhood		35	7.70	22
Elementary		146	40.10	115
Secondary		77	21.30	61
Administrative		7	5.20	15
Special		1	1.00	3
Combined		99	23.70	68
Not Certified		11	.70	2
Other		9	.30	1

Table 13

Present Teaching Assignment

	System			
	Private		Public	
Grades	%	N	%	N
1	10.00	38	10.00	27
2	7.00	27	8.00	23
3	5.00	20	6.00	16
4	6.00	24	5.00	14
5	5.00	17	5.00	15
6	3.00	12	4.00	10
7	1.00	5	5.00	13
8	2.00	6	1.00	3
9	.00	1	1.00	2
10	1.00	2	0.00	1
11	.00	0	1.00	2
12	.00	1	1.00	2
Special or Non Graded	4.00	15	53.00	152

Table 14

Highest Degree Held

	System			
	Private		Public	
	%	N	%	N
Bachelors	44.40	171	34.80	100
Masters	50.60	195	52.30	150
Specialist	2.60	10	9.40	27
Doctorate	.50	2	2.80	8
Other	1.90	7	.70	2

Table 15

Number of Years in
Present Position

	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Private	5.58	4.80	380
Public	11.05	8.03	277

Table 16

Number of Years in Other Professional Positions

	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Private	6.37	5.80	309
Public	8.86	7.26	152

Table 17

Membership in Professional Organizations

	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Private	1.38	1.41	358
Public	2.70	5.64	287

Table 18

Analysis of Variance
for Self

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig.
System	291374.12	1	291374.12	69.43	0.00
Level	40674.53	2	20337.27	4.85	0.01
System by Level	4310.88	2	2155.44	0.51	0.60
Residual	2795146.00	666	4196.91		
Total	3165482.00	671	4717.56		

Table 19

Mean Values of

Self

	Elementary	Secondary	Administrative	School Type Means
Public	126.08 (183)	122.22 (69)	104.63 (35)	122.53
Private	169.52 (289)	168.12 (74)	130.36 (22)	167.02
Level Means	152.68	145.97	114.56	

Table 20

Analysis of Variance
for Teachers

Source of Variance	SS	DF	MS	F	P
System	174015.38	1	174015.38	36.79	.000
Level	23845.01	2	11922.50	2.52	.081
System x Level	2775.56	2	1387.78	.29	.746
Residual	3150329.00	666	43734.80	9.25	.000
Total	3369003.00	671			

Table 21

Mean Values of

Teachers

	Elementary	Secondary	Administrative	School-type Means
Public	141.85 (183)	145.70 (69)	126.63 (35)	140.92 (287)
Private	177.01 (289)	175.80 (74)	147.59 (22)	175.10 (385)
Level Means	163.38 (472)	161.27 (143)	134.72 (57)	

Table 22

Analysis of Variance
for Administrators

Source of Variance	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig. of F
System	196521.50	1	196521.50	95.15	0.00
Level	24034.21	2	12017.10	5.82	0.00
System x Level	14205.31	2	7102.66	3.44	0.03
Residual	1309405.00	634	2065.31		
Total	1535740.00	639	2403.35		

Table 23

Mean Values for

Administrator

	Elementary	Secondary	Administrative	School-type Means
Public	132.31 (183)	137.48 (69)	110.40 (35)	130.88 (287)
Private	173.22 (289)	170.24 (74)	147.95 (22)	171.20 (385)
Level Means	157.36 (472)	154.43 (143)	124.89 (57)	

Table 24

Aspiration Levels of Teachers

Number of Positions Applied For	System			
	Public		Private	
	%	N	%	N
0	73.2	210	89.6	345
1	6.6	19	4.4	17
2	2.8	8	1.6	6
3	1.4	4	.3	1
4	0	0	.3	1
5	0	0	0	0
6	.3	1	0	0
No Response	.3	1	0	0

Table 25

Difficulty in Obtaining
A Job In
Administration

	System			
	Public		Private	
	%	N	%	N
Impossible	4.2	12	1.0	4
Very Difficult	31.7	91	20.3	78
Difficult	44.3	127	43.9	169
Fairly Easy	14.6	42	22.1	85
Easy	5.2	15	2.1	8
Other	0	0	10.7	41

Table 26

Salary as Source of Income

	System			
	Private		Public	
	%	N	%	N
Primarily	26.80	103	47.70	137
Partially	43.10	166	38.70	111
Extras	24.20	93	9.40	27
Other	6.00	23	4.10	12

Table 27

Decision Point for the

Teaching Profession

	System			
	Private		Public	
	%	N	%	N
Elementary	13.80	53	26.80	77
Secondary	19.70	76	22.60	65
College	36.40	140	28.20	81
After College	19.00	73	8.40	24
After Teaching	4.20	16	7.30	21
Other	5.50	27	6.60	19

Table 28

Source of Influence

	System			
	Private		Public	
	%	N	%	N
Mother	7.80	30	15.3	44
Father	5.20	20	1.4	4
Husband	2.90	11	.7	2
Friend	5.20	20	4.9	14
Professor	19.20	74	29.3	84
Other	59.70	230	48.5	139

Table 29

Mean Values

Would You Apply for an Administrative Position?	Semantic Scale		
	Self	Teachers	Administrators
Yes	141.02 (212)	155.71 (212)	146.88 (212)
No	157.56 (380)	167.69 (380)	162.17 (380)
Maybe	130.75 (8)	177.63 (8)	174.75 (8)

Table 30

Teachers Perception of Self

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Signif Of F
System	272161.38	1	272161.38	61.43	0.00
Level	1285.00	1	1285.00	0.29	0.59
Apply For Administrative Position	19793.57	2	9896.78	2.23	0.11
Residual	2636071.00	595	4430.37		
Total	2952873.00	599	4929.69		

Table 31

Teachers Perception of Teachers

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Signif Of F
System	169345.44	1	169345.44	33.97	0.00
Level	25.88	1	25.88	0.01	0.94
Apply for Administrative Position	18229.97	2	9114.98	1.83	0.16
Residual	2966142.00	595	4985.11		
Total	3155520.00	599	5267.98		

Table 32

Teachers Perception of Administrators

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Signif Of F
System	219976.25	1	219976.25	39.68	0.00
Level	180.72	1	180.72	0.03	0.85
Apply For Administrative Position	31183.06	2	15591.53	2.81	0.06
Residual	3298049.00	595	5542.94		
Total	3553872.00	599	5933.01		

Table 33

Positive Aspects of Educational Administration
(% of Total Responses)

	System			
	Public (287)		Private (385)	
	%	N	%	N
Power	11.15	32	10.65	41
Salary	58.19	167	58.82	224
Prestige	25.78	74	31.69	122
Greater Service	46.34	133	35.32	136
Greater Challenge	55.40	159	58.96	227
Administrative Tasks	14.98	43	15.84	61
Limited Contact with Students	9.41	27	3.38	13

Table 34

Negative Aspects of Educational Administration

	System			
	Public (287)		Private (385)	
	%	N	%	N
Hours	24.74	71	35.84	138
Pressure	66.20	190	66.49	256
Greater Responsibilities	31.71	91	23.64	91
Discipline	36.93	106	18.96	73
Lack of Involvement with Students	34.84	100	62.34	240
Dealing with Parents	20.91	60	31.17	120
Advanced Training and Certification	8.93	24	19.48	75

Table 35

Enjoy Job

	System			
	Private		Public	
	%	N	%	N
Great	65.50	252	49.8	143
Quite	27.30	105	34.8	100
Neither	2.60	10	4.9	14
Not very	3.10	12	5.6	16
Not at all	.30	1	.7	2
Other	1.30	5	4.2	12

Table 36

Termination Factors

	System			
	Private		Public	
	%	N	%	N
Better Job	7.80	30	25.1	72
Married	1.00	4	.3	1
Husband Transferred	6.80	26	3.8	11
Job Outside Education	14.80	57	15.7	45
Other				157

Table 37

How Do You Perceive
the Job of Educational
Administrator?

	System			
	Public		Private	
	%	N	%	N
Excellent	11.8	34	7.0	27
Desirable	37.3	107	24.4	94
Undecided	21.3	61	30.9	119
Undesirable	20.2	58	25.5	98
Difficult	7.0	20	7.5	29
Other	2.4	7	4.7	18

Table 38

Public School Respondents Reporting
Number of Children Requiring Care

	0	1	2-3	4-6	No Response
Elementary	39 (21.3)	40 (21.9)	14 (7.7)	1 (.5)	89 (48.6)
High School	15 (21.7)	21 (30.4)	5 (7.2)	1 (1.4)	27 (39.1)
Administrators	12 (34.3)	5 (14.3)	0 (5.7)	2 (0)	16 (45.7)

$\chi^2 = 7.13$

df = 8 $\alpha = .52$

Table 39

Private School Respondents Reporting Number of Children Requiring Care

	0	1	2-3	4-6		No Response
Elementary	3 (1.0)	35 (12.1)	15 (5.2)	1 (0.3)	1 (0.3)	234 (81.0)
High School	0 (0.0)	8 (10.8)	3 (4.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	63 (85.1)
Administrators	0 (0.0)	1 (4.5)	2 (9.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	19 (86.4)

$\chi^2 = 3.72$

df =10 $\alpha = .96$

Table 40

Public School Respondents Reporting
Hours per Week at Work

	20-30	31-40	41-50	51 & over	No Response	
Elementary	3 (1.6)	95 (51.9)	68 (37.2)	8 (4.4)	9 (4.9)	183
High School	2 (2.9)	32 (46.4)	27 (39.1)	7 (10.1)	1 (1.4)	69
Administrators	0 (0)	1 (2.9)	22 (62.9)	11 (31.4)	1 (2.9)	35

$\chi^2 = 47.42$

df = 8 $\quad\quad \alpha = .000$

Table 41

Private School Respondents Reporting
Hours Per Week at Work

	20-30	31-40	41-50	51 & over	No Response	
Elementary	50 (17.3)	121 (41.9)	105 (36.3)	8 (2.8)	5 (1.7)	289
High School	5 (6.8)	32 (43.2)	27 (36.5)	6 (8.1)	4 (5.4)	74
Administrators	0 (0.0)	2 (9.1)	14 (63.6)	5 (22.7)	1 (4.5)	22

$\chi^2 = 39.42$

df =8 $\alpha = .00$

Table 42

Public School Respondents Reporting
Hours per Week Outside Work

	1-10	11-20	21-30	31-40	Over 41	No Response	
Elementary	104 (56.8)	50 (27.3)	8 (4.4)	3 (1.6)	3 (1.6)	15 (8.2)	183
High School	41 (59.4)	24 (34.8)	1 (1.4)	1 (1.4)	0 (0)	2 (2.9)	69
Administrators	20 (57.1)	11 (31.4)	3 (8.6)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (2.9)	35

$\chi^2 = 9.16$

$df = 10$

$\alpha = .52$

Table 43

Private School Respondents Reports

Hours Per Week Outside Work

	0-10	11-20	21-30	31-40	41 & over	No Response	
Elementary	204 (70.6)	70 (24.2)	5 (1.7)	1 (0.3)	0 (0.0)	9 (3.1)	289
High School	35 (47.3)	23 (31.1)	11 (14.9)	1 (1.4)	1 (1.4)	3 (4.1)	74
Administrators	14 (63.6)	7 (31.8)	1 (4.5)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0))	22

$X^2 = 35.64$

df =10 α =.0001

Table 44

Public School Respondents Reporting

A Flexible Schedule

	Inflexible	Sometimes	Flexible	Other	No Response	
Elementary	17 (9.3)	68 (37.2)	89 (48.6)	2 (1.1)	7 (3.8)	183
High School	8 (11.6)	26 (37.7)	26 (37.7)	2 (2.9)	7	69
Administrators	0 (0)	14 (40.0)	20 (57.1)	1 (2.9)	0	35

$\chi^2 = 13.25$

$df = 8$ $\alpha = .10$

Table 45

Private School Respondents Reporting
A Flexible Schedule

	Inflexible	Sometimes	Flexible	Other	No Response	
Elementary	4 (1.4)	78 (27.0)	198 (68.5)	3 (1.0)	6 (2.1)	289
High School	4 (5.4)	25 (33.8)	44 (59.5)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.4)	74
Administrators	0 (0.0)	3 (13.6)	14 (63.6)	0 (0.0)	5 (22.7)	22

$\chi^2 = 38.33$

$df = 8$ $\alpha = .0000$

Table 46

Public School Respondents Reporting

A Flexible Superior

	Unwilling	Willing	Sympathetic	Other	No Response	
Elementary	3 (1.6)	25 (13.7)	145 (79.2)	8 (4.4)	2 (1.1)	183
High School	5 (7.2)	9 (13.0)	50 (72.5)	2 (2.9)	3 (4.3)	69
Administrators	0 (0.0)	1 (2.9)	30 (85.7)	1 (2.9)	3 (8.6)	35

$\chi^2 = 17.26$

df = 8 $\alpha = .03$

Table 47

Flexible Superior

	Unwilling	Willing	Sympathetic	Other	No Response	
Elementary	0 (0.0)	8 (2.8)	275 (95.2)	2 (0.6)	4 (1.4)	289
High School	1 (1.4)	2 (2.7)	70 (94.6)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.4)	74
Administrators	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	17 (77.3)	2 (9.1)	3 (13.6)	22

$\chi^2 = 41.62$

df = 10

$\alpha = .000$

Table 48

Public School Respondents
Willingness to Relocate

	Definitely	Probably	Maybe	Probably Not	Definitely Not	
Elementary	15 (8.6)	17 (9.7)	33 (18.9)	46 (26.3)	64 (36.6)	75
High School	5 (7.4)	14 (20.6)	11 (16.2)	18 (26.5)	20 (29.4)	68
Administrators	4 (11.8)	6 (17.6)	7 (20.6)	8 (23.5)	9 (26.5)	34
						277

$\chi^2 = 7.10$

$df = 8$

$\alpha = .53$

Table 49

Private School Respondents

Willingness to Relocate

	Definitely	Probably	Maybe	Probably Not	Definitely Not	
Elementary	13 (4.6)	16 (5.7)	42 (14.8)	82 (29.0)	130 (45.9)	283
High School	2 (2.9)	2 (2.9)	14 (20.0)	21 (30.0)	31 (44.3)	70
Administrators	7 (31.8)	1 (4.5)	5 (22.7)	5 (22.7)	4 (18.2)	22

$\chi^2 = 33.41$

$df = 10$ $\alpha = .0001$

Table 50

Public School Respondents'
Perception of Difficulty in Getting
An Educational Administration Job

	Impossible	Very Difficult	Difficult	Fairly Easy	No Response	
Elementary	9 (4.9)	61 (33.3)	78 (42.6)	27 (14.8)	8 (4.4)	183
High School	3 (4.3)	18 (26.1)	31 (44.9)	11 (15.9)	6 (8.7)	69
Administrators	0 (0.0)	12 (34.3)	18 (51.4)	4 (11.4)	1 (2.9)	35

$\chi^2 = 5.69$

$df = 8$ $\quad\quad$ $\alpha = .68$

Table 51

Private School Respondents' Perception of Difficulty in Getting An Educational Administration Job

	Impossible	Very Difficult	Difficult	Fairly Easy	Easy	Other	No Response	
Elementary	1 (0.3)	3 (1.0)	59 (20.4)	128 (44.3)	58 (20.1)	6 (2.1)	34 (11.8)	289
High School	0 (0.0)	1 (1.4)	18 (24.3)	32 (43.2)	17 (23.0)	2 (2.7)	4 (5.4)	74
Administrators	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (4.5)	9 (40.9)	10 (45.5)	0 (0.0)	2 (9.1)	22

$\chi^2 = 12.91$

$df = 12$ $\alpha = .38$

Table 52

Why Women Are Not Found In
Administrative Positions

	System			
	Public		Private	
	%	N	%	N
Contacts	10.8	31	1.0	2
Experience	12.2	35	4.0	17
Power Structure	5.9	17	5.0	21
Number of Qualified Persons	9.1	26	4.0	17
Women lack Expertise, Training & Certification	3.1	9	4.0	15
Lack of Available Positions	22.3	64	24.0	94
Sex Bias	2.8	8	18.0	18
No Communications About Job	2.1	6	1.0	2
Stress	1.4	4	2.0	6
Never Considered the Job		0	2.0	9
Other - Negative	2.1	6	10.0	40
Women Love Classrooms	.7	2	1.0	2
Need Certification	4.9	14	3.0	11
No Discrimination Against Women	.7	2	0.0	0
Women Get Anything They Want	1.4	4	5.0	21
Other - Positive	3.5	10	13.0	50
No Response		49	15.0	58

Table 53

Lack of Women in Educational Administration

	System			
	Public		Private	
	%	N	%	N
Don't know	6.3	18	1.0	4
Family Responsibility	5.9	17	12.5	48
Don't Apply-Not Interested	8.7	25	8.1	31
Not Certified	2.1	6	4.2	16
Unable to Handle Discipline	2.8	8	1.0	4
Pressures of Job	11.8	34	3.4	13
Traditional Role	11.5	33	22.9	88
Sexist Attitudes of Personnel Department	28.9	83	10.6	41
No Encouragement	.7	2	1.3	5
Devoted to Classroom	.3	1	3.1	12
Lack of Drive	2.4	7	3.9	15
Other	4.2	12	11.4	44
Lots of Opportunity	3.5	10	6.0	23
No Response	10.8	31	10.6	41

Appendix A

MILLER'S ROLE DEFINITION

Instructions

These instruments are known as semantic differentials. They are designed to assess the meaning that people assign to certain concepts. The concepts appear at the top of each page in CAPS with the way in which you are to consider the concept. Below the concept are a series of scales. The end of each scale is identified by an adjective. Between the adjectives are a series of seven scale points represented by O's. Mark the O at the point you believe best represents the concept on each descriptive scale. You must rate the concept on each scale.

Example: DOG

intelligent O O O O O ● O stupid
clean O O O ● O O O dirty
fast O O ● O O O O slow
dull O O O O O ● O sharp

For this person, the meaning of the concept dog appears to be pretty sharp, rather fast and pretty stupid while the clean-dirty dimension is not really too relevant.

Each semantic differential has the same set of scales but the concepts and/or the way the concept is to be considered is different. Work quickly. Do not spend a lot of time on each scale. Your first response is probably the best one. DO NOT return to a previous page to change or review your ratings of a concept. Work straight through from beginning to end. Thank you.

How I Really Am

MYSELF

Dispassionate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Emotional	Assured	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Reticent
Active	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Passive	Follower	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Leader
Defensive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Aggressive	Superior	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Inferior
Objective	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Subjective	Taciturn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Talkative
Submissive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Dominant	Blunt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Tactful
Calm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Excitable	Weak	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Strong
Unpleasant	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Pleasant	Cautious	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Adventurous
Careless	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Precise	Logical	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Irrational
Dependent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Selfsufficient	Tender	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Tough
Wasteful	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Efficient	Hardheaded	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Impressionable
Rough	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Gentle	Cooperative	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Competitive
Worldly	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Sheltered	Sneaky	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Direct
Delicate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Rugged	Stable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Insecure
Retiring	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Assertive	Quiet	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Loud
Confident	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Unsure	Aware	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Insensitive
Decisive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Vacillating	Complacent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ambitious

How I Really View

TEACHERS

Dispassionate	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	Emotional	Assured	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	Reticent
Active	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	Passive	Follower	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	Leader
Defensive	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	Aggressive	Superior	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	Inferior
Objective	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	Subjective	Taciturn	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	Talkative
Submissive	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	Dominant	Blunt	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	Tactful
Calm	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	Excitable	Weak	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	Strong
Unpleasant	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	Pleasant	Cautious	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	Adventurous
Careless	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	Precise	Logical	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	Irrational
Dependent	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	Selfsufficient	Tender	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	Tough
Wasteful	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	Efficient	Hardheaded	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	Impressionable
Rough	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	Gentle	Cooperative	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	Competitive
Worldly	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	Sheltered	Sneaky	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	Direct
Delicate	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	Rugged	Stable	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	Insecure
Retiring	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	Assertive	Quiet	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	Loud
Confident	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	Unsure	Aware	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	Insensitive
Decisive	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	Vacillating	Complacent	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	Ambitious

How I Really View

ADMINISTRATORS

Dispassionate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Emotional	Assured	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Reticent
Active	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Passive	Follower	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Leader
Defensive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Aggressive	Superior	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Inferior
Objective	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Subjective	Taciturn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Talkative
Submissive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Dominant	Blunt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Tactful
Calm	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Excitable	Weak	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Strong
Unpleasant	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Pleasant	Cautious	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Adventurous
Careless	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Precise	Logical	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Irrational
Dependent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Selfsufficient	Tender	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Tough
Wasteful	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Efficient	Hardheaded	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Impressionable
Rough	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Gentle	Cooperative	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Competitive
Worldly	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Sheltered	Sneaky	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Direct
Delicate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Rugged	Stable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Insecure
Retiring	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Assertive	Quiet	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Loud
Confident	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Unsure	Aware	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Insensitive
Decisive	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Vacillating	Complacent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ambitious

Appendix B

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS I.D.No. _____

1. Age
   20-24____ 25-29____ 30-39____ 40-49____ 50-65____ Older____

2. Marital Status
   Single _____ Married _____

3. Race
   Caucasion _____ Black _____ Oriental _____ Indian _____

4. Number of Children
   None ____ 1 ____ 2 ____ 3 ____ 4 ____ or more ____

5. Degrees held
   High School ____ BA/BS ____ MA/MS/M.Ed. ____ 6th Year Ed. Specialist ____
   Ph.D/Ed.D. ____ Other ____

6. What is your certification?
   Early Childhood _____ Elementary _____ Secondary _____ Administration _____

7. What is your present teaching position?

_____	_____	_____
School	Grade Level & Subject	No. of Years

8. Please list any other teaching experience:

_____	_____	_____
School System	Grade Level & Subject	No. of Years
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

9. What professional organizations are you a member of? _____

   _____

10. When did you decide to become a teacher?
    Elementary School ____ High School ____ College ____ After College ____
    Other ____

11. Who influenced you or encouraged you to become a teacher?
    Family (mother or father) ____ Husband ____ Professional (teacher or professor) ____ Friends ____ Other ____

12. Do you enjoy teaching?
    A great deal ____ Quite a bit ____ Neither like it or dislike it ____
    Not very much ____ Not at all ____

13. How long do you plan to remain in the education profession?
    1-2 years ____ 2-5 years ____ 5-10 years ____ 10 or more ____ Indefinitely ____

14. What factors would cause you to terminate?
    Better job ____ Marriage ____ Children ____ Husband's transfer ____ Other ____

15. How far do you travel (one way) to work each day?
0-5 miles ____ 6-10 miles ____ 11-15 miles ____ 16-20 miles ____
over 21 miles ____

16. Would you be willing to relocate for an administrative position?
Definitely ____ Probably ____ Maybe ____ Probably not ____
Definitely not ____

17. If married, what is your husband's salary?
Under $15,000 ____ $15-20,000 ____ $26-35,000 ____ $36-45,000 ____
Over $46,000 ____

18. What is your salary?
$8-12,000 ____ $13-17,000 ____ $18-25,000 ____ $26-35,000 ____
$36,000 and over ____

19. In what ways does your salary contribute to maintaining your family?
Primary ____ Partially ____ Accounts for extras like vacations,
savings accounts, etc. ____

20. What type of elementary school did you attend?
Public ____ Parochial ____ Private ____

21. For each of the elementary schools you attended, please indicate the number of principals you had of each sex.
Male ____ Female ____

22. What type of high school did you attend?
Public ____ Parochial ____ Private ____

23. For each of the high schools you attended, please indicate the number of principals you had of each sex.
Male ____ Female ____

24. Who do you think make better principals?
Males ____ Females ____ Sex is not a factor ____

25. Which sex principal do you prefer working with?
Male ____ Female ____ No preference ____

26. Number of hours spent at school per week on job.
20-30 ____ 31-40 ____ 41-50 ____ over 50 ____

27. Number of hours spent outside of school on job per week.
0-10 ____ 11-20 ____ 21-30 ____ 31-40 ____ over 40 ____

28. If you have children, how many of your children require care while you work?
1 ____ 2-3 ____ 4-6 ____

29. If you have children, how old was your oldest child when you returned to work?
0-1 ____ 2-4 ____ 5-7 ____ 8 and older ____

30. Do you perceive your schedule as being flexible should family emergencies require your time?
Inflexible ____ Sometimes flexible ____ Flexible ____ other ____

31. Is your immediate superior willing to make schedule alterations when family emergencies arise?
Unwilling ____ Willing but unsympathetic ____ Willing and sympathetic ____
Other ____

32. How do you perceive the job of educational administrator?
Excellent ____ Desirable ____ Undecided ____ Undesirable ____
Difficult or impossible ____

33. What are the most attractive aspects of an educational administrator? Please circle those applicable.

Power	Greater Personal Challenge
Salary	Administrative Tasks
Prestige	Negative Aspects of Teaching
Greater Service to Education	Other _____

34. What about the job of educational administrator detracts from its desirability? Please circle those applicable.

Hours	Deviation from stereotypic feminine role
Pressure	Dealing with Parents
Greater responsibilities	Advanced training and certification
Discipline	Other _____
Lack of involvement with students	

35. How difficult do you think it is to obtain a job in administration?
Impossible ____ Very difficult ____ Difficult ____
Fairly easy ____ Easy ____

36. What makes you feel this way? _____

_____

37. What do you think accounts for the lack of women in educational administration? _____

_____

_____

_____

Appendix B

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ADMINISTRATORS I.D.No._____

1. Age
   20-24 ____ 25-29 ____ 30-39 ____ 40-49 ____ 50-65 ____ Older ____

2. Marital Status
   Single ____ Married ____

3. Race
   Caucasion ____ Black ____ Oriental ____ Indian ____

4. Number of Children
   None ____ 1 ____ 2 ____ 3 ____ 4 ____ or more ____

5. Degrees held
   High School ____ BA/BS ____ MA/MS/M.Ed. ____ 6th Year Ed. Specialist ____
   Ph.D/Ed.D. ____ Other ____

6. What is your certification?
   Early Childhood ____ Elementary ____ Secondary ____ Administration ____

7. What is your present administrative position?

_____	_____	_____
School	Grade Levels	No. of Years

8. Please list any other teaching and administrative experience:

_____	_____	_____
School System	Grade Level & Subject	No. of Years
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

9. What professional organizations are you a member of? _____

   _____

10. When did you decide to enter the field of educational administration?
    Elementary School ____ High School ____ College ____ After College ____
    After being a teacher ____ Other ____

11. Was teaching or administration your first choice occupation?
    Teaching _____ Administration _____

12. Who influenced you or encouraged you to become an administrator?
    Family (mother or father) ____ Husband ____ Professional (teacher or professor) ____ Friends ____ Other ____

13. Do you enjoy educational administration?
    A great deal ____ Quite a bit ____ Neither like it or dislike it ____
    Not very much ____ Not at all ____

14. How long do you plan to remain in the education profession?
    1-2 years ____ 2-5 years ____ 5-10 years ____ 10 or more ____ Indefinitely ____

15. What factors would cause you to terminate?
Better job ____ Marriage ____ Children ____ Husband's transfer ____
Other ____

16. How far do you travel (one way) to work each day?
0-5 miles ____ 6-10 miles ____ 11-15 miles ____ 16-20 miles ____
over 21 miles ____

17. Would you be willing to relocate for an administrative position?
Definitely ____ Probably ____ Maybe ____ Probably not ____
Definitely not ____

18. If married, what is your husband's salary?
Under $15,000 ____ $15-20,000 ____ $26-35,000 ____ $36-45,000 ____
Over $46,000 ____

19. What is your salary?
$8-12,000 ____ $13-17,000 ____ $18-25,000 ____ $26-35,000 ____
$36,000 and over ____

20. In what ways does your salary contribute to maintaining your family?
Primary ____ Partially ____ Accounts for extras like vacations,
savings accounts, etc. ____

21. What type of elementary school did you attend?
Public ____ Parochial ____ Private ____

22. For each of the elementary schools you attended, please indicate the number of principals you had of each sex.
Male _____ Female _____

23. What type of high school did you attend?
Public _____ Parochial _____ Private _____

24. For each of the high schools you attended, please indicate the number of principals you had of each sex.
Male _____ Female _____

25. Who do you think make better principals?
Males _____ Females _____ Sex is not a factor _____

26. Which sex principal do you prefer working with?
Male _____ Female _____ No preference _____

27. Number of hours spent at school per week on job.
20-30 ____ 31-40 ____ 41-50 ____ over 50 ____

28. Number of hours spent outside of school on job per week.
0-10 ____ 11-20 ____ 21-30 ____ 31-40 ____ over 40 ____

29. If you have children, how many of your children require care while you work?
1 _____ 2-3 _____ 4-6 _____

30. If you have children, how old was your oldest child when you returned to work?
0-1 _____ 2-4 _____ 5-7 _____ 8 and older _____

31. Do you perceive your schedule as being flexible should family emergencies require your time?
Inflexible ____ Sometimes flexible ____ Flexible ____ other ____

32. Is your immediate superior willing to make schedule alterations when family emergencies arise?
Unwilling ____ Willing but unsympathetic ____ Willing and sympathetic ____
Other ____

33. How do you perceive the job of educatonal administrator?
Excellent ____ Desirable ____ Undecided ____ Undesirable ____
Difficult or impossible ____

34. What are the most attractive aspects of an educational administrator? Please circle those aplicable.

Power

Salary

Prestige

Greater Service to Educaton

Greater Personal Challenge

Administrative Tasks

Negative Aspects of Teaching

Other _____

35. What about the job of educational administrator detracts from its desirability? Please circle those applicable.

Hours

Pressure

Greater responsibilities

Discipline

Lack of involvement with students

Deviation from stereotypic feminine role

Dealing with Parents

Advanced training and certificaton

Other _____

36. How difficult do you think it is to obtain a job in administration?
Impossible ____ Very difficult ____ Difficult ____ Fairly easy ____
Easy ____

37. What makes you feel this way? _____

_____

38. What do you think accounts for the lack of women in educational administration? _____

_____

_____

_____